[422-1]

Eric I. Abraham, Esq. Christina L. Saveriano, Esq. HILL WALLACK, LLP 202 Carnegie Center CN 5226 Princeton, NJ 08543-5226 Phone (609) 924-0808 Fax (609) 452-1888 E-mail: eia@hillwallack.com

Richard J. Basile, Esq.
David W. Aldrich, Esq.
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06905-5619
Phone: (203) 324-6155

Phone: (203) 324-6155 Fax: (203) 327-1096

٧.

Attorneys for Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

ASTRAZENECA LP and,	:
ASTRAZENECA AB,	:

:

: Civil Action No.

Plaintiffs, : 08-1512 (RMB)(AMD)

: **DOCUMENT**

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

APOTEX, INC. and, : ORDER TO SEAL

APOTEX CORP.

Defendants.

THIS MATTER having been brought before the Court by Hill Wallack LLP and St. Onge Steward Johnston & Reens LLC seeking entry of an Order sealing documents pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5.3(c) in the presence of attorneys for Plaintiffs, and the Court having read and

considered the moving, opposing and reply papers, if any, and having heard argument of counsel, and for good cause shown:

IT IS on this 23rd day of Chaquest, 2012,

THE COURT FINDS that this is a patent action that involves confidential information, specifically the documents or portions of the following documents filed under seal contain confidential information that Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp. have a legitimate interest in protecting as this information is confidential because its competitors in the marketplace could utilize the information to gain an unfair competitive advantage to their detriment.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that the clearly defined and serious injury that would result should the Order to Seal not be granted is that valuable business and trade secrets created at substantial expense by Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp. will be lost and competitors would unjustly gain access to them. Specifically, Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp.'s confidential research information and manufacturing process would be revealed to their competitors and these competitors would unjustly gain the ability to thwart, anticipate or usurp those plans and strategies to the competitors' advantage and Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp.'s loss.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that no less restrictive alternative is available to prevent the defined and serious injury to the parties due to the fact that Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp. rely on the confidential materials in its Brief In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,524,834; Statement of Material Facts Not In Dispute In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S.

Patent No. 7,524,834; and Exhibits B, D, E, F, H, I, J and K to the Declaration of Erin R.

Woelker In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No.

7,524,834.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp. have

complied with the dictates set forth in Local Civil Rule 5.3(c)(2) and in case law related thereto.

THEREFORE, for good cause shown and in order to preserve the confidentiality of the

aforesaid documents:

IT IS ORDERED that Defendants Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp.'s motion to file under

seal Defendant's Brief In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of

U.S. Patent No. 7,524,834; Statement of Material Facts Not In Dispute In Support of Motion for

Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,524,834; and Exhibits B, D, E, F,

H, I, J and K to the Declaration of Erin R. Woelker In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment

of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,524,834 is hereby granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above-listed document shall be maintained under

seal by the Clerk of the Court.

wee Mario Sumb